REMARKS

Claims 1-37 are pending in this application and stand rejected following the Board of Patent Appeals affirmation of the Examiner's decision. The independent claims have been amended to clarify the meaning of the phrases "service reference" and "bookmark list" In view of the amendments and the following remarks, the Applicant requests that the Claims be allowed and the application passed on to issuance.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC §103:

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-37 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over US. Pub 2002/0138564 to Treptow in view of US Pub 2005/0228711 to Lahey.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for monitoring a web-based service and recites the following acts:

1. receiving automatically at a client a service reference to a status of a job in a network service, the service reference including data identifying a location where a status page for the job can be obtained;
2. adding the service reference to a bookmark list of a browser on the client; and
3. removing automatically the service reference from the bookmark list on the client when the job is completed by the network service.

To summarize, Claim 1 recites a method in which a service reference is automatically received at a client. That service reference is then added to a bookmark list on the client. Claim 1 recites that the service reference includes data

identifying a location where a status page for the job can be obtained and that the bookmark list is a bookmark list of a browser on the client.

Treptow fails to teach or suggest receiving, automatically or otherwise, at a client a service reference to a status of a job in a network service where that service reference includes data identifying a location where status information for the job can be obtained. Treptow also fails to teach or suggest or adding the recited service reference to a bookmark list of a browser on the client. Treptow does teach the use of a client to display a web page through which the user can discern the job status of various job requests. Logically, the client in some fashion receives an URL or some other reference for that web page. However, Treptow makes no indication that the URL for the web page shown in Treptow Fig. 5 is received automatically at a client or added to a bookmark list on that client. Lahey is silent on these points.

For at least these reasons, Claim 1 is patentable over the cited references as are Claims 2-4, which depend from Claim 1.

Claims 5, 14, 18, and 19 are independent claims that, like Claim 1, recite acts, or system elements for implementing acts, in which a service reference is automatically received and added to a bookmarks list. As clarified above, the cited references do not teach or suggest such acts. For the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable over the cited references so are Claims 5, 14, 18 and 19. Claims 6-13 depend from Claim 5 while Claims 15-17 depend from Claim 14 and are each patentable due their dependence from a patentable base claim.

Furthermore, Claim 5 is directed to a method for monitoring a web-based service and recites the following:

1. receiving automatically in a user's personal imaging repository in an autonomous network service a service reference to a status of a job in a job-performing network service, wherein the autonomous network service is independent from the job-performing network service and

does not facilitate performance of the job at the job-performing network service;

2. adding the service reference to a bookmark list in the user's personal imaging repository; and
3. removing automatically the service reference from the bookmark list in the user's personal imaging repository when the job is completed by the job-performing network service.

Neither Treptow nor Lahey mentions a personal imaging repository in an autonomous network service let alone receiving a service reverence in a personal imaging repository or adding a service reference to a bookmark in a personal imaging repository. The Examiner's attention is drawn to paragraph [0061] of the Specification for an exemplary definition of the "personal imaging repository."

For at least this additional reason, Claim 5 is patentable over the cited references.

Claim 20 is directed to a program product that includes machine readable program code for causing a machine to perform the following method of Claim 1. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claim 20 and Claims 21-23 which depend from Claim 20.

Claim 24 is directed to a program product that includes computer readable program code, that when executed, implements the method of Claim 5. For at least the same reasons Claim 5 is patentable, so are Claim 24 and Claims 25-32 which depend from Claim 24.

Claim 33 is directed to a program product that includes computer readable program code, that when executed, implements the method of Claim 14. For at least the same reasons Claim 14 is patentable, so are Claim 33 and Claims 34-36 which depend from Claim 33.

Claim 37 is directed to a program product that includes computer readable program code, that when executed, implements the method of Claim 18. For at least the same reasons Claim 18 is patentable, so is Claim 37.

CONCLUSION:

Claims 1-37 are felt to be in condition for allowance. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing the application to issue is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Shell S. Simpson

By /Jack H. McKinney/
Jack H. McKinney
Reg. No. 45,685

January 27, 2009